

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION**

GREGORY LEWIS BRADLEY, JR.,	:	Case No. 1:19-cv-275
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	Judge Timothy S. Black
	:	
vs.	:	Magistrate Judge Stephanie K.
	:	Bowman
UNDERWRITERS AT BANKERS	:	
INSURANCE COMPANY UNDER	:	
POLICY NO. 527083660, <i>et al.</i> ,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	

**DECISION AND ENTRY
ADOPTING THE REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE (Docs. 10, 16)**

This case is before the Court pursuant to the Order of General Reference to United States Magistrate Judge Stephanie K. Bowman. Pursuant to such reference, the Magistrate Judge reviewed the pleadings and, on May 17, 2019, submitted a Report and Recommendation. (Doc. 10). Plaintiff Gregory Lewis Bradley, Jr. filed objections and an addendum to his objections. (Docs. 11, 12).

Then, on June 27, 2019, Plaintiff filed a motion to enforce judgment for a specific act. (Doc. 15). The Magistrate Judge submitted a second Report and Recommendation related to this motion, suggesting that this motion be denied because it did not cure the deficiencies in Plaintiff's complaint. (Doc. 16). No objections were filed in response to the second Report and Recommendation.

As required by 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), the Court has reviewed the comprehensive findings of the Magistrate Judge and considered *de novo* all

of the filings in this matter. Upon consideration of the foregoing, including Plaintiff's objections and addendum to his objections (Docs. 11, 12), the Court finds that the Reports and Recommendations (Docs. 10, 16) should be and are hereby adopted in their entirety.

Plaintiff's objections and addendum to his objections are not well-taken. Plaintiff does not provide specific objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation. (Docs. 11, 12). Instead, Plaintiff generally reiterates the arguments from his complaint, which are not proper objections pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72. *See, e.g., Bradley v. United States*, No. 18-1444, 2018 WL 5084806, at *3 (6th Cir. Sept. 17, 2018) (quoting *Miller v. Currie*, 50 F.3d 373, 380 (6th Cir. 1995) ("A party's objections are not sufficiently specific if they merely restate the claims made in the initial petition, 'disput[e] the correctness' of a report and recommendation without specifying the findings purportedly in error, or simply 'object[] to the report and recommendation and refer[] to several of the issues in the case.'")).

Moreover, as discussed by the Magistrate Judge, when liberally construing Plaintiff's complaint, Plaintiff is clearly challenging his state court proceedings and 2011 drug-trafficking conviction. (Doc. 10 at 3–4). Although Plaintiff generally defines a variety of legal terms related to contract law, property law, and secured transactions, Plaintiff's exhibits and factual analysis attack the state court proceedings. (*See* Docs. 9, 9-1, 10, 12, 12-1, 15). As recognized by the Magistrate Judge – and the Northern District of Ohio in a similar case with similar arguments brought by Plaintiff – these allegations,

even liberally construed, do not state a claim. (*Id.*) *See also Lewis Bradley v. Ohio*, No. 1:14 CV 811, 2014 WL 4302537 (N.D. Ohio Aug. 27, 2014).

Accordingly, for these reasons:

1. The Reports and Recommendations (Docs. 10, 16) are hereby **ADOPTED**;
2. Plaintiff's objections (Docs. 11, 12) are **OVERRULED**;
3. Plaintiff's complaint is **DISMISSED** pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2)(B) and 1915A(b)(1);
4. All remaining motions (Docs. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 15) are **DENIED**;
5. The Court certifies that pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), an appeal of this Order would not be taken in good faith, and therefore **DENIES** Plaintiff leave to appeal *in forma pauperis*; and
6. The Clerk shall enter judgment accordingly, whereupon this case is **TERMINATED** on the docket of this Court.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: 4/16/2021

s/Timothy S. Black
Timothy S. Black
United States District Judge